



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/681,253	03/08/2001	Raymond K.J. Ong	GECAN-3214	5453
23465	7590	09/13/2002		
JOHN S. BEULICK C/O ARMSTRONG TEASDALE, LLP ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE SUITE 2600 ST LOUIS, MO 63102-2740			EXAMINER WAKS, JOSEPH	
			ART UNIT 2834	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 09/13/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.	09/681,253	Applicant(s)	ONG ET AL.
Examiner	Joseph Waks	Art Unit	2834

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM  
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.  
2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.  
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.  
4) Claim(s) 5-27 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) Claim(s) 6 is/are allowed.  
6) Claim(s) 5,7-10,12-16 and 18-26 is/are rejected.  
7) Claim(s) 11,17 and 27 is/are objected to.  
8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.  
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) All b) Some \* c) None of:  
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.  
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
    a)  The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.  
15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.  
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. **Claims 7-9, 12-15, 18-24** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Chari et al. (US 4,278,905)**.

**Chari et al.** disclose a back iron 32 and non-magnetic tooth back portion having a plurality of non-magnetic teeth 51 installed in the back iron.

Re claims 7-9, the method of attaching the teeth to the back iron and installing the back iron in the machine is inherent to the disclosed structure.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claim 5** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Chari et al. (US 4,278,905)** in view of **Tesar (US 5,355,743)** and **Lloyd et al. (US 5,177,054)**.

**Chari et al.** disclose a back iron 32 and a plurality of non-magnetic teeth 51 having a back section 55 with a key installed in the slots 57 of the back iron of a superconducting electrical machine. However, **Chari et al.** do not teach the non-magnetic teeth comprising a

carbon fiber or a fiber polymer, and the machine being a high temperature, superconducting machine.

**Tesar** discloses the use of the carbon fiber material in electrical machines for the purpose of reducing the weight of the rotating parts while simultaneously providing high structural strength characteristics.

**Lloyd et al.** Disclose the use for the high temperature, superconducting materials in electrical machines for the purpose of reducing the size and the weight of the motor for the specific power rating.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to design the machine as taught by **Chari et al.** and to provide the non-magnetic teeth comprising the well known in the art high carbon fiber material as taught by **Tesar** for the purpose of reducing the weight of the rotating parts while simultaneously providing a high structural strength characteristics since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to design the machine as taught by **Chari et al.** and to provide well known in the art high temperature superconducting material as taught by **Lloyd et al.** for the purpose of reducing the size and the weight of the motor for the specific power rating by using materials working at significantly higher temperatures than the liquid state temperature of helium.

The method of attaching the teeth to the back iron and installing the back iron in the machine is inherent to the disclosed structure.

5. **Claim 10** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Chari et al. (US 4,278,905)** in view of **Tesar (US 5,355,743)**.

**Chari et al.** disclose the method essentially as claimed. However, **Chari et al.** do not disclose the non-magnetic teeth comprising a carbon fiber.

**Tesar** discloses the use of the carbon fiber material in electrical machines for the purpose of reducing the weight of the rotating parts while simultaneously providing high structural strength characteristics.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to design the combined machine and to provide the non-magnetic teeth comprising the well known in the art high carbon fiber material as taught by **Tesar** for the purpose of reducing the weight of the rotating parts while simultaneously providing a high structural strength characteristics since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

6. **Claims 16, and 26** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Chari et al. (US 4,278,905)** in view of **Roger (US 4,375,043)**.

**Chari et al.** discloses all elements essentially as claimed. However, it does not disclose the teeth comprising at least one a glass laminate, a carbon fiber, and a fiber polymer.

**Roger** discloses an electrical machine having teeth 14 bounded to the back iron 2 with key and made of a glass laminate for the purpose of providing a desired strength and rigidity to the non-magnetic tooth structure.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to design the machine as taught by **Chari et al.** And to provide the teeth comprising at least one a glass laminate as taught by **Roger** for the purpose of providing a desired strength and rigidity to the non-magnetic tooth structure.

7. **Claim 25** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Chari et al. (US 4,278,905)** in view of **Everton (US 5,670,838)**.

**Chari et al.** disclose all elements essentially as claimed. However, **Chari et al.** does not disclose the teeth being attached to the back iron with adhesive.

**Everton** discloses a superconducting electrical machine having teeth 9 bounded to the back iron 10 with an adhesive for the purpose of providing a magnetic reluctance.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to design the machine as taught by **Chari et al.** and to provide the teeth being attached to the back iron with adhesive as taught by **Everton** for the purpose of providing a magnetic reluctance.

*Allowable Subject Matter*

8. **Claim 6** is allowed.

9. **Claims 11, 17, and 27** are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The feature of the non-magnetic tooth including at least one embedded conductor, in combination with the other limitations present, are neither disclosed nor taught by the prior art of record.

***Response to Arguments***

10. Applicant's arguments filed on August 12, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's arguments do not comply with 37 CFR 1.111(c) because they do not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. Further, they do not show how the amendments avoid such references or objections.

In claim 7 applicant recites the method for fabricating a stator with non-magnetic teeth involving fabricating the back iron and attaching a non magnetic tooth back portion comprising plurality of non-magnetic tooth to the back iron. However, no specific method of fabricating the back iron or attaching the tooth back portion to the iron is claimed. Therefore, any method of fabricating the stator that reads on the claim meets the claim's limitations. In this particular case, **Chari et al.** disclose the non-magnetic tooth back portion having a plurality of non-magnetic teeth installed in the back iron. The disclosed structure and its components, inherently, are fabricated and put together using any one or several of manufacturing methods, and as such it discloses the method as claimed.

Re claims 12 and 18, examiner directs applicant's attention to Figure 2 where **Chari et al.** disclose the plurality of teeth 51 unitary with back portion 55 mounted on the back iron 32.

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 5 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

***Communication***

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph Waks whose telephone number is (703) 308-1676. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 8 am to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nestor R Ramirez can be reached on (703) 308-1371. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-1341 for regular communications and (703) 305-1341 for After Final communications.

Application/Control Number: 09/681,253  
Art Unit: 2834

Page 8

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1782.

  
JOSEPH WAKS  
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER  
TC-2800

JW  
September 10, 2002